DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 403 826 HE 029 871

AUTHOR	Mukenge, Ida Rousseau
TITLE	Building Bridges. Meeting Institutional Needs by Collaboration Through Interinstitutional Exchanges.
INSTITUTION	Council of Independent Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 96
NOTE	27p.; For a related document, see ED 376 775.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council of Independent Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 320, Washington, DC 20036-1110 ($7 prepaid).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; *Black Colleges; College Administration; College Faculty; College Role; *Exchange Programs; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Institutional Role; Interschool Communication; *Partnerships in Education; *Private Colleges; Program Development; Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Council of Independent Colleges; United Negro College Fund

ABSTRACT

Discusses the rationale, experiences, and outcomes of the Interinstitutional Exchange Program (IEP), sponsored jointly by the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) and the United Negro College Fund (UNCF). CIC made grants of up to $15,000 each to support exchanges of faculty and administrators between nine private historically black colleges and nine other private liberal arts institutions. The exchanges were designed to create non-threatening environments for open dialogue, build structures and processes that enable respectful communication, develop strategies for institutions to collaborate in defining and solving problems, enable improved awareness of institutional needs, and encourage individual self-development. The experiences of individuals and institutions in the IEP are reviewed. Suggestions for developing and implementing further exchanges are discussed, including the need for focus, planning, institutional self-knowledge, choosing the right partner institution, seeking campus-wide involvement, appointing exchange leaders, effective communication, flexibility, risk taking, documentation, evaluation, reporting of findings, and management of the post-exchange process. An appendix lists the colleges participating in the IEP. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Building Bridges

Meeting Institutional Needs by Collaboration Through Interinstitutional Exchanges

ED 403 826

by Ida Rousseau Mukenge
Professor of Sociology, Morehouse College

ME029871

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Council of Independent Colleges

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

A Report From

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Independent colleges and universities have long been committed to create a society that more readily embraces the differences of cultural and ethnic diversity. Estimates that, by the year 2000, one third of those under 18 will be people of color makes this issue all the more urgent for today's colleges and universities. Demographics aside, however, colleges are motivated by the understanding that diversity is good for society. Through their work in this arena, they contribute to society as a whole.

One way by which the members of the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) have been working toward goals of diversity has been through a project sponsored jointly by CIC and the United Negro College Fund (UNCF). In addition to enhancing leadership at private historically black colleges and universities, the project has sought to develop productive links between UNCF institutions and other private liberal arts colleges and universities. Exchanges of faculty, administrators, and students between institutions have been key components of this highly productive project.

These exchanges have been instructive and inspirational for their participants. We also believe that they have greater value, as a model for other colleges and universities. It is a pleasure to share here preliminary findings, representing what we have learned from our experiences with exchanges. In so doing, we hope to offer guidelines for those who might be interested in pursuing a similar path. (Indeed, CIC's own work continues today with new exchanges.)

CIC gratefully acknowledges the corporate and foundation sponsors of the *Enhancing Black College Leadership* project:

- **Aetna Foundation, Inc.**
- **BellSouth Foundation**
- **Maurice Falk Medical Fund**
- **Lilly Endowment, Inc.**
- **Monsanto Fund**
- **Charles Stewart Mott Foundation**
- **The Prudential Foundation**
- **Rockwell International**
- **The Sears-Roebuck Foundation**
- **Shell Oil Company Foundation**
- **Tandy Corporation**
- **The Teagle Foundation, Inc.**
- **The Warner-Lambert Charitable Foundation**

It is an honor to recognize CIC's partnership with UNCF and its president, William H. Gray III. I wish to also acknowledge CIC Senior Associate Ida Rousseau Mukenge, whose research and analysis is reflected in this report. From the CIC staff, Executive Vice President Russell Garth and Vice President for Communications Stephen Pelletier helped shape the report.

As always, I welcome and encourage comments from readers of this report.

Allen P. Splete
President, CIC
November 1996

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BUILDING BRIDGES

Meeting Institutional Needs by Collaboration Through Interinstitutional Exchanges

by Ida Rousseau Mukenge
Professor of Sociology, Morehouse College

In the 1991-92 academic year, the Council of Independent Colleges made grants of up to $15,000 each to support exchanges of faculty and administrators between nine private historically black colleges and nine other private liberal arts institutions. These exchanges were part of a larger CIC project, *Enhancing Black College Leadership*. Conducted with the support of the United Negro College Fund, that project had the dual goals of building leadership expertise in historically black private colleges and universities, and building bridges between those institutions and other private colleges in CIC.

Since those first nine exchanges were launched, CIC has supported 19 additional exchanges. Several hundred individuals from more than 50 colleges and universities have participated. In addition, CIC plans to sponsor future exchanges.

The total of this experience has had many effects. In the sections below we will review particular benefits that colleges and individuals have reaped from taking part in the CIC Interinstitutional Exchange Program (IEP).

The point of this report, however, is that in the course of our experience we have learned a great deal about how to conduct successful exchanges. We believe this approach is a powerful and effective methodology for effecting institutional reform—and in the case of these particular exchanges, for addressing a vital societal issue, diversity. Our intent here is to present what we have learned as guidelines, to both instruct and encourage others who may wish to benefit from interinstitutional exchanges.

This report translates the essence of the lessons learned from the first phase of the IEP into a collection of suggestions for successful and mutually beneficial exchanges. It is intended for:

- CIC member institutions considering participation in the CIC/UNCF exchange program;

- Former IEP participants seeking ways to follow through and consolidate the benefits of completed programs, disseminate the outcomes of their participation across the campus, or share their experiences with other institutions;

- Other colleges and universities seeking strategies to address issues of diversity, multicultural exchanges, and intercultural communication and education programs; and

- Anyone interested in knowing more about interinstitutional programs in general, and the CIC/UNCF exchange program in particular.

After eight years of encouraging contacts, developing reciprocal confidence, and working toward mutual understandings, CIC and UNCF are now moving to refine the exchange process and disseminate more widely the lessons learned through the exchanges. The first phase of establishment we called **Coming Together** (this is the title of a comprehensive CIC report, published in 1994, on the first six years of the *Enhancing Black College Leadership* project). We call this second phase of institutionalization **Building Bridges**. The bridge is an appropriate metaphor because it is a stable fixture that accepts two-way traffic, thus suggesting both permanence and mutuality.

RATIONALE AND EXPERIENCES

We wish to start this essay with a discussion of why we value exchanges as a mechanism for meeting our program goals. From the start, interinstitutional exchanges of administrators, faculty, and students were seen as a core strategy of the *Enhancing Black College Leadership* project, both to increase access of UNCF institutions to CIC resources and benefits, and to give all CIC institutions an opportunity to share their resources, insights, and capabilities across cultures. We believe that interinstitutional exchanges are effective mechanisms for helping us meet our goals—of fostering understanding, appreciation, and respect for the role of individual, institutional, and subcultural differences in teaching and learning.

Our experience in the IEP has helped us frame an intellectual rationale. First, and fundamentally, the exchanges have fostered communication in the best sense of the term—the transfer of meaning through various verbal and nonverbal media. We have assumed that practice and experience are among the best ways to develop cross-cultural communication skills. We further believe that the unique ensemble of institutions in CIC offers excellent opportunities for the fostering of cross-cultural communication. The IEP is a deliberate, systematic strategy directed toward this end.

Second, our focus for this work—teaching and learning—has many contexts within the framework of CIC's IEP. There is a pedagogical context: our exchanges regularly result in improved curricula and better teaching techniques. There is an individual aspect: the exchanges engage those taking part in the personal give-and-take of teaching and learning with others in the program. Finally, there is a larger, societal context: the program has sought to show models about developing diversity as part of higher education's overall contributions to national renewal.

Our experiences identify several specific ways in which exchanges are effective. To summarize, exchanges:

- Create non-threatening environments for open dialogue;
- Build structures and processes that enable respectful communication;
- Develop strategies for institutions to collaborate in defining and solving problems;
- Enable improved awareness of institutional needs; and
- Encourage individual self-development.

These points merit elucidation.

Creating non-threatening environments.

The ability to transmit meaning minimally requires common definitions of the situation and mutually intelligible sets of symbols in order for the parties concerned to convey, interpret, and understand messages. The attitudes, feelings, values, and experiences of the receiver and sender influence all aspects of the communication process. When meaningful communication breaks down, strain can result. The underlying source of the breakdown may be structural or interpersonal.

The potential for strain between individuals and groups stems from a host of factors—including, for example, differences in racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, regional, or even institutional culture, in such matters as perceived loyalties and responsibilities, bases for decision making, and principles of authority and status.

The interpersonal dimension of strain often centers around a fundamental failure of either party to understand what the other is trying to say. When one person judges another's statements in terms of his own frame of reference, the lack of attention to the other's frame of reference can distort meaning and cause reactions to intentions that are not originally there.

What may appear as a lack of coherence between the values and goals of those with different backgrounds presents a personal challenge to students, administrators, and faculty. In the IEP, there is opportunity for the internal and more common aspects of diversity to come together, in a non-threatening environment, with other external dimensions, such as race, ethnicity, social class, and campus culture.

Special efforts to listen with understanding can overcome the tendency to judge, evaluate, approve, or disapprove the statements of others. People are less likely to be threatened by good listeners. They talk more freely, problems are more likely to be aired openly, and meaning is less likely to be distorted by the listener or by the speaker's reactions to the listener. This reveals another desired outcome of the IEP environment—enhancing feelings of self-efficacy and overall satisfaction particularly in new and unfamiliar settings.

Some of the most successful of CIC's exchanges took special effort to foster dialogue in non-threatening environments. Official activities in several exchanges, for example, began not with formal meetings but with informal get-togethers of faculty and students, sometimes on a neutral site. (In one case, this exercise took the form of three weekend retreats of participant students and faculty, away from either home campus, with structured and unstructured activities designed to build trust, understanding, and cooperative spirit.) In most of these meetings, conversations started with a discussion of differences between participants. Almost invariably, they eventually wound their way to mutual understanding of common interests and

outlooks. In these cases, the process of creating non-threatening environments—where genuine dialogue, striving hard for mutual understanding could take place—was vitally important to the success of the exchange. A report to CIC from one IEP exchange made this point:

> *Some of the most valuable interchange was informal, as those in each institution learned about the history, character and current issues of the other—and persons from both institutions became well acquainted on a personal basis.*

Structures and processes for respectful communication.

Differences of communication styles and techniques, as well as failure to recognize the existence of those differences, can inhibit communication. Without thinking, we can sometimes assume that all people communicate alike and just like ourselves. In several cases, CIC exchanges proved to be powerful mechanisms for leading individuals to recognize differences in communication and learning styles, and the inherent personal shortcomings of assuming everyone has the same style. Often, the exchange was frank and to some participants, startling. But as one exchange faculty member wrote, we can learn from the fact that "real exchange of the heart and not platitudinous, rehearsed, and sanitized dialogue can lead to understanding, cooperation, and mutual respect."

The results of the exchange between Ohio Dominican College and Wilberforce University summarize that effect well. In the course of that exchange, students and faculty had many opportunities to discuss ideas, perspectives, backgrounds, and problems. Profound lessons emerged from those dialogues. An English professor from Ohio Dominican College wrote:

> *Ideologically, we made astounding advances in our awareness of racial and cultural differences. Perhaps those of us at Ohio Dominican learned most of all. Our complacency about our majority logic and style of learning was shaken forever. ODC students were forced, many of them for the first time, to consider what they were about and what they will need to understand their world, a world filled with persons they had never really come to "see." They also had to listen to voices they had never really "heard" before. Perhaps most importantly, project participants came to understand that they must be ready to find, accept, and deal with real differences of opinion and style among their peers and must learn to respect those differences....We will never be the same and we can help others to change as well.*

Another example came in the exchange between Lewis University, a predominantly white institution in Illinois, and Morehouse College, a black college for men in

Atlanta. Faculty members and students from both institutions made extensive visits to each other's campuses, where they lectured in classes; advised each other on curricula, admissions, and retention; attended church services; visited historical sites; and engaged in intensive dialogues in formats both formal and informal. The process helped participants develop a better understanding of what until then had been unfamiliar cultures. For example, faculty from Lewis came back from their experience visiting Morehouse to report that the experience has given them profound insights, including a deeper appreciation of the black male experience, increased respect for black leadership through exposure to students and visitors at Morehouse, and a better understanding of the speaking styles of African American men.

Many communication problems stem from the assumption on the part of the sender that the receiver understands what is meant and the receiver's assumption that he understands what has been sent. Obviously, that is not always the case. The Lewis/Morehouse exchange helped participants identify and overcome such barriers to good communication. For example, after the Morehouse visit, the moderator for student government at Lewis wrote:

> *I now realize that many African American males have an aggressive speaking style. It is not necessarily a sign of aggression and must be moved beyond.*

And similarly, a Lewis faculty member commented after the exchange visit:

> *I continue to see the point of Afrocentrism. I sense that I have not done enough to meet African American students [at Lewis] on their own turf.*

The report from the exchange sums up what was learned:

> *The largest impact of the exchange to the individuals involved, particularly those traveling to Morehouse, was a deeper appreciation of the richness of racial difference (i.e., role of separate institution, blackness, linguistic and body language meanings, religious experience/meaning) and learning about common ground (i.e., common hopes, frustrations, dreams, programs, student problems). No visitor or participant of the on-campus visits came away from their visits with Morehouse personnel and students the same. All increased their interest and commitment to building multiculturalism on the Lewis campus.*

The ability to reach a stage of respectful communication led one exchange faculty member to report back to his president after traveling to a historically black college, "Despite the fact of our different sizes and student populations, we end up being struck much more by the similarities between our two campuses than by our differences."

Strategies for cooperative problem definition and problem solving.
The IEP experience also created opportunities for exchange members to engage in cooperative work to define problems and identify solutions. Sometimes such collaboration focused on mutual problems. In other cases, one institution drew on the expertise of another to help it address a particular issue. The process of collaboration proved to be helpful not just in addressing the particular problem, but in showing participants a way to work productively together with those who may have been strangers just a few days before.

A college in Rochester, New York and a historically black college in New Orleans, for example, both wanted opportunities for their students in education to have practical teaching experiences in culturally diverse settings. The institutions collaborated to design and place education majors in teaching practicums. Students from the New York college went to teach in inner-city New Orleans schools. Their counterparts from Louisiana traveled to teach in predominantly white schools in New York State.

The exchange between Bennett and Converse colleges provides an excellent example of student teamwork. A faculty member observed:

> *One of the greatest benefits of these exchanges is simply the opportunity they provide for white and black students to work together on meaningful tasks, to share in social activities, and have fun together—things that, unfortunately, occur all too infrequently on college campuses today.*
>
> *Throughout the project, students worked together to foster better understanding of racial and cultural issues and to understand and overcome their own barriers to communication. The most gratifying part for me was to see the students come up against the hard places, begin to recognize and accept differences in values and priorities, and find a way to accommodate those differences to reach a consensus. It was equally exciting to see the students find significant areas of commonality and shared values....The white students achieved a whole new understanding of what it means to be a black student on a predominantly white campus through their own experiences of being a minority on the [historically black college] campus. African American students from the predominantly white institution had the opportunity to experience life on a predominantly black campus, and I believe this program helped to give black students on the [predominantly white] campus a greater voice in campus life.*

There are countless other examples. In many cases, historically black colleges consulted with their exchange counterparts to provide counsel on integrating

multicultural perspectives into curricula and practical advice on how to nurture campus sensitivity to racial differences. For example, based on advice from a historically black college, one college has said it will take the following steps:

> *We will work more systematically and effectively in supporting self-esteem/development of black males and other minorities; institutionalize and expand the student support team concept of intervention [to support at-risk students]; add diversity components to our required freshman seminar program; build support networks within the campus and with other local institutions to support minority faculty and professional staff; and inaugurate sensitivity training and education in multicultural education [for our faculty].*

Most colleges and universities seek ways to become truly multicultural. Location alone, particularly when a college is in a culturally and racially homogeneous area, is often a very real impediment. Appropriately, many CIC colleges drew on the expertise of historically black colleges in the exchanges to obtain advice about designing multicultural curricula and making campus climates more hospitable to diverse populations. In addition to advice on these fronts, many practical suggestions were offered to help predominantly white colleges recruit and retain faculty and students of color.

Once an exchange achieved a level of open dialogue and cooperation, many participating faculty found themselves sharing ideas and techniques to improve teaching, learning, and research. There are many examples in the exchanges of faculty lecturing in each other's courses. In one case, two professors taught several-week modules on their respective exchange campus. In another example, biology faculty from one college consulted with colleagues at another institution who had introduced writing-across-the-curriculum to their biology curricula. Once they saw how effective it was, the first college eagerly adopted the second college's model. Administrators shared details and advice about model programs, including approaches to freshman orientation and recruiting strategies.

Assessing institutional needs.

Exchanges can build bridges across home campuses as well as between exchange partners. We found that participation in exchanges often forced administrators, faculty, and students to conduct something of an institutional self-study on issues of race, diversity, and cultural differences. The results of this introspective look were usually informative, sometimes dramatically so, and often led institutions to develop a better sense of their institution's place and role in a multicultural world. Similarly, the act of preparing for the exchange can bring together diverse components of the campus, link disciplines, and create exciting energies for campus collaboration. In

these ways, exchanges can lead a campus to a better understanding of diversity, and to new organizational productivity.

Participation in an exchange with Cornell College led Fisk University to look anew beyond its own campus. A Fisk administrator wrote:

> *The Cornell exchange has been a part of a more general renewal of interest at Fisk in exchanges both foreign and domestic....It has involved more faculty members and more senior academic administrators than have most of the other exchange projects....Hence it seems safe to say...that the program is helping in a manner disproportionate to its costs as Fisk seeks to combat whatever tendencies it may have toward institutional insularity.*

The same exchange led Cornell College to a better understanding of its place in a multicultural world. Wrote a faculty member:

> *These exploratory exchanges have sharpened Cornell College's sense of self in the multicultural arena, broadened institutional awareness of other academic cultures, and provided opportunities for minority and other students to experience a more diverse academic community in and beyond Mt. Vernon, Iowa.*

An administrator from Lewis University made this statement:

> *Without the exchange, we would be two to three years behind where policy and practice are moving this fall semester.*

Reflecting on his team's experience at a historically black college, a faculty member from a predominantly white college observed:

> *This program...brings fresh perspectives; it clears the air, and that is absolutely necessary on this campus.*

In one exchange after another, the process of the exchanges—the movement of students and faculty from one institution to another—provided fundamental lessons about important social issues and, most importantly, about participants themselves. An education professor from Doane College wrote of his students' trip from rural Nebraska to visit LeMoyne-Owen College in Memphis:

> *The whole trip was most humbling. I had made an assumption that the students were at a certain level of understanding about people of all cultures, but really, they were on the first part of the journey.*

Increasing individual self-development.

Apart from involving an institution in a process of self-discovery and stock-taking—which in turn often reveals hidden institutional resources and opportunities for improvement—participation in an exchange can also lead to self-discovery by individuals.

For example, an Oakwood College exchange professor to Dominican College of San Rafael reported that the time away from her classes gave her an opportunity to research Afrocentric psychology. She discovered resources, knowledge, and expertise in her own background that she was not aware of. Upon her return, she realized that the social science curriculum at her home institution needed updating. In response, the Afrocentric Research Program was initiated. Students and mentors from six departments are involved. The result has been increased interest in general research by Oakwood students and faculty. This example illustrates the importance of reflection on the implications of the project for the faculty member, her home institution, and the host institution.

THE CIC EXCHANGES

The projects completed during the first phases of the IEP ranged from relatively unconstrained exploratory experiences with diversity to systematically structured partnerships based on well-formulated and clearly defined goals and objectives. In many cases, participation in an exchange involved the partners in cooperative problem solving and problem definition. Some examples:

Stillman College (Alabama) and **Marietta College** (Ohio)
Faculty exchanges in a variety of areas, including freshman year programs, multicultural education, and business.

Dillard University (Louisiana) and **Nazareth College of Rochester** (New York)
Practicum experiences for teacher education students in diverse settings.

Johnson C. Smith University (North Carolina) and **Warren Wilson College** (North Carolina)
Exchanged middle management teams (admissions, registrar, financial aid), guest lecturers, and faculty-student teams to investigate programs not offered at their home institution.

Oakwood College (Alabama) and **Bradford College** (Massachusetts)
Focused on library collections and automation, and the integration of multicultural perspectives into general education courses.

Rust College (Mississippi) and **Drury College** (Missouri)
Exchanges in art, English, undergraduate research, freshman studies, and of student choirs.

Wilberforce University (Ohio) and **Ohio Dominican College** (Ohio)
Year-long collaborative effort of faculties responsible for teaching writing.

Huston-Tillotson College (Texas) and **Elmhurst College** (Illinois)
As part of curricular revisions taking place on both campuses, faculty from Elmhurst shared their successful strategies for Writing Across the Curriculum, while faculty from Huston-Tillotson advised Elmhurst on its efforts to educate students about the perspectives and contributions of people from different ethnic backgrounds and cultures.

LeMoyne-Owen College (Tennessee) and **Doane College** (Nebraska)
Exchanged five faculty visiting lecturers—in politics, business, teacher education and the humanities—to help staff and students at both institutions broaden their cultural perspectives.

Morehouse College (Georgia) and **Lewis University** (Illinois)
Engaged white faculty and staff as minority consultants at a historically black institution and vice versa. Thus, the two institutions advised each other on their respective programs to improve multicultural awareness through campus programs and courses.

Fisk University (Tennessee) and **Cornell College** (Iowa)
Delegations of faculty and administrators shared expertise on a range of programs: the core curriculum, women's studies, library automation, integrating multiculturalism across the curriculum, and intergroup relations.

A full list of the CIC-IEP exchanges is found at the back of this report.

It is important to note that grant support for these exchanges was relatively modest—averaging $10,000. Impressively, participating colleges were able to leverage their grants to create results that belie the amount of dollars available. Further, several colleges collaborated within their exchanges to develop proposals and obtain grant funding for additional exchange activities.

RESULTS

The exchanges have had substantive effects on institutions—ranging from prodding modestly faster curricular review at one college to profound, campus-wide raising of social consciousness and moves to action. CIC's IEP exchanges resulted in these specific types of activities and reforms:

- Two colleges collaborated to develop a course, "Leadership Skills for Women in a Multicultural Society," that was team tested on both campuses, and will be taught on both campuses in the future.

- As part of one exchange, biology faculty showed colleagues at another institution how they implement writing-across-the-curriculum in their discipline. The second college readily adopted the approach.

- Several historically black colleges advised their exchange counterparts on issues of campus climate for diversity. Student life issues were closely scrutinized, as were procedures for faculty and student recruitment and retention. The practical advice resulted in policy shifts at many campuses.

- Several exchanges featured opportunities for white and black students to gather on each other's campuses in formal and informal conversations about race and student life. Several exchanges reported that the conversations started warily, became frank and instructive, and finally resulted in strong

interinstitutional bonds at the student level. In several cases, students made a point of mentioning that as the exchanges continued, they welcomed their new colleagues back to campus as friends.

- Several exchanges gave students the opportunity to go from a rural to an urban campus or vice versa, as a means to become immersed temporarily in a different cultural population.

- Through an exchange with a college in Nebraska, administrators of a teacher education program at a historically black college in Tennessee developed contacts with schools and started discussions about placing graduates in teaching jobs in Omaha.

- One exchange prompted faculty research in Afrocentric psychology, ultimately resulting in curricular reform through a new Afrocentric Research Center that renewed a college's interest in research.

- One exchange brought an African American professor to a suburban Chicago campus at a time marked by both racial unrest in Los Angeles and multicultural issues on campus. In meetings with students, faculty and staff, the professor helped the campus discuss these issues.

- Two colleges used mutual interests in humanities and prison education programs to jointly develop multicultural curricular materials.

- One participating college drew on the expertise of its exchange counterpart to transform a freshman orientation course into a comprehensive freshman-year program. Together the two colleges developed a proposal for a freshman-year curriculum that subsequently received major grant support.

- A professor of business from a historically black institution served as a visiting scholar at a predominantly white institution.

- One of the most intensive exchanges included joint summer faculty development seminars, faculty/student exchanges in music, science research collaboratives, and freshman-year consultation.

- Students from a college in upstate New York traveled to New Orleans to experience teaching in "a Southern urban multicultural setting with non-white ethnics in the majority." Students from the Louisiana college went north for a similar experience with reverse demographics.

- Several exchanges brought faculty together to share thoughts about pedagogy, use of equipment, disciplinary trends, and other information to bolster teaching and learning.

- "Shadowing" each other on their respective campuses as part of another exchange, two academic deans found the experience an invaluable way to share ideas, talk about their administrative styles, and consult on common problems.

- Several exchange participants used the program to obtain specific expert consultant advice for campus improvement in such areas as accreditation, admissions, fund raising, and information technologies.

- One exchange involved a joint meeting of institutional trustees.

GUIDELINES FOR SUCCESSFUL EXCHANGES

The sum of our experience leads us to make the following broad suggestions for others who are considering participating in exchanges:

Select a focus.

We found that the most successful exchanges started with clearly defined expectations about outcomes, and a fairly narrow focus for specific work or action on a particular campus program, problem, discipline, or other defined area. It helped when an exchange was designed to meet a specific institutional need.

The examples of exchanges listed above suggest some areas of focus. Other foci might be critical thinking; quantitative reasoning; values and ethics; proposal writing, fund raising, and grantsmanship; institutional research, planning, and assessment; service-learning; international education (study abroad, faculty training, and curriculum development); library and computer services; math and science education; and information technology.

Institutions have worked together on a single project that both schools would use—in one case, two exchange partners collaborated to develop a course which was later taught on both campuses. In another exchange, an outside consultant helped the partners develop a writing curriculum in a series of faculty development workshops. Exchanges have often included seminars and performances.

Planning is essential.

Unless exchange partners plan for the continuity, sustainability, and future funding of their work, participating colleges risk "one-shot" experiences that promise little in the way of institutionalization of outcomes.

Conscientious preparation and carefully managed experiences are particularly important to the success of exchanges between highly diverse institutions. Those institutions which oriented visitors and actively managed exchange experiences reported greater successes. An excellent example is found in the exchange between Benedict College and Columbia College. To launch their exchange, both institutions prepared and delivered orientation workshops about their respective institutions that reflected on college history, traditions, and students. With these workshops, participants were properly oriented and their expectations were adequately managed, making them aware of both the generalities and the specifics of the other institution's culture and climate.

The more extensive and collaborative the planning, the greater the likelihood of success. For example, Wilberforce University and Ohio Dominican College designed a year-long collaborative effort by faculty focused on the teaching of writing. Exchange planners agreed beforehand on expected goals. Before any exchange activities began, faculty participants were responsible for reading background materials and essays, and preparing letters of introduction to students.

Balance the workload so that both institutions involved share responsibility. Take concerted steps to prepare for the actual physical exchange of individuals.

Know your own institution.

Before embarking on an exchange, it is important to determine institutional needs and become more conscious of strengths and limitations. A general inventory of resources has several kinds of benefits. First, it allows you to identify and articulate what will attract exchange partners. Second, an awareness of needs, especially those to be addressed by the exchange, allows you to more clearly communicate expectations and more realistically present your institution to potential partners. Resource inventories are not only useful for planning the exchange, but they can also serve as baseline studies for monitoring and evaluation.

Choose the right partner.

It may seem obvious, but it is worth reflecting on: the success of an exchange depends in large part on basic connections between institutions. These might be similarity of missions, shared denominational backgrounds, friendships between administrators, or geographic proximity. It is vitally important that exchange participants carefully consider all aspects of its match with a potential partner before they agree to participate.

We have found that geographic proximity of two exchange colleges is often advantageous, although examples of distant colleges suggest that it is not a prerequisite for success. Administrators planning exchanges would do well to consider the purely practical ramifications of visiting other colleges, and might do well to seek exchanges with colleges that are nearer rather than farther.

Personal relationships between individuals at partner campuses sometimes provided the basis for establishment of exchanges. We found, however, that such relationships may not necessarily be sufficient to sustain long-term institutional relationships. Some exchanges, for example, experienced problems when there was turnover among key individual participants. It is probably advantageous to build an exchange around factors in addition to personal relationships.

Seek campus-wide involvement.

In the same way that community-based, grass roots political action sometimes works more effectively than commands handed down from the top, widespread campus involvement in exchanges is preferable to their isolation within a single unit or the concentration of exchange activities at the upper administrative levels. More successful experiences were reported where several units of the college were involved, and where students were involved. Cooperation across campus disciplines affords an excellent way of involving many campus units in interinstitutional exchanges.

Appoint exchange leaders.

Each exchange requires the commitment of a key person at each institution who sees the value in the exchange and is willing to push to make it a reality, despite obstacles of time, distance, administrative distractions on each campus, personalities, and the general complexity of competing academic agendas that are the hallmark of any college.

A second challenge in developing a successful exchange is the amount of time and individual energy that must be committed to the process. At all partner schools, the exchange is an extra task. Many exchange faculty admit they had little concept of the time that would be required to create and operate an exchange when they were first approached by their academic deans. (The average teaching load at most historically black colleges is not less than 12 credit hours per term, and is often 15 or even more. Extra duties of a direct or quasi-administrative nature are routinely added on.) Accommodating the extra responsibilities of working on an exchange requires both inspiration and true dedication.

Program coordination should be handled by someone who is close to academic administrators, faculty, and students. The program should be located in a unit that is integral to the campus. We suggest, however, that exchanges do not rely solely on top administrators for actual project management. The president is probably too busy. Similarly, while the chief academic officer on each campus should be committed to the program and should exercise general oversight, he or she is probably also too busy for day-to-day management.

A caveat. While individual leadership is important, one person cannot do all the work alone. Use individual linkages to consolidate a network of participants on both campuses, but avoid relying too much on those single links. Strive instead to involve as broad a spectrum of individuals as possible in both exchange activities and exchange planning. In this way, delays related to start-up time, unforeseen changes in personnel, and normal attrition will not jeopardize the entire program.

Communicate regularly.

Frequent, substantive communication between participants in exchanges is vitally important. Stay in touch with your counterparts. Use the telephone, mail, fax and e-mail.

Similarly, keep exchange colleagues on your own campus informed of the progress of the partnership.

Stay flexible.

Changes of personnel, policy, funding, and the like can have a significant impact on an exchange. It is important that all parties retain the flexibility to shift course, amend exchange goals, adjust personnel, or make other changes to ensure the continued success of an exchange.

Describing student and faculty interactions in the Bennett College/Converse College exchange, a project director wrote, "Sometimes we had to back up, go around or alter the plan in order to keep going." The participants found, however, that "there were no obstacles that could not be surmounted with persistence, flexibility, and willingness to readjust the plan to accommodate circumstances."

Take risks.

The notion of an exchange presumes some outreach on the part of those who would participate, which necessarily assumes a certain amount of risk. Indeed, risk was a palpable and perhaps pervasive element in all of the exchanges, as faculty and administrators from significantly different communities begin the process of engaging in cooperation. Here is where background conditions, habits of communication, expectations of reward, and breadth of common interests are put to the test. A case in point is when a faculty member realizes that the biggest impact of the exchange was the visceral feeling of being a white person suddenly placed in an African American setting, and being overwhelmed by what it means to be a minority.

Anxiety and risk are also present when exchange faculty are thrust "on stage" at their partner institution. Several professors spoke of taking extra care in preparing lectures for colleagues at exchange campuses.

Ultimately, however, insofar as it can prompt new productivity, help craft new relationships, and teach participating institutions and individuals about themselves, risk can be a good thing.

Risk is also associated with creativity, which is another attribute of successful exchanges. We urge you to be creative. Rather than pattern your exchange entirely on

an existing model, think creatively to identify new qualities that your institution can bring to an exchange.

Document your progress.

Envisioning the exchange as a continuous process and documenting what is taking place can yield concrete outcomes. It can also save time and effort now and in the future. As part of their exchange, the deans at Rust and Drury colleges collaborated to develop this helpful guide:

1. Briefly describe the activities in your part of the collaboration (giving dates, individuals involved, location, and brief description of activity).
2. Assess the impact of the activities on your program and on the individuals involved.
3. Comment on your perception of the impact of this collaboration on the whole institution.
4. What was good or worked well?
5. What problems did you encounter?
6. Should we pursue further activities with out exchange partners?
7. What suggestions do you have for future activities?

Evaluate your results.

We have found that the exercise of reporting individual and institutional experiences from an exchange can help to clarify what was learned and extend the exchange's value. We cannot overemphasize the importance of taking time to reflect on the exchange experience, for it is in the exercise of letting the experience talk to you that important and valuable lessons make themselves known.

One place to start such an exercise is where you began it: take a look at your original plan and goals for the exchange. Did you meet those goals? How did the nature of the exchange change over time? What lessons can be learned from your work?

Given our experience, we suggest the following reporting format to help you share insights within institutions and supporters:

- Describe exchange activities in order of event.
- Appraise the impact of the follow-up on the individual participants and on their units at the college (e.g., academic department, library, development office, student services, etc.).
- Assess the project's overall impact on the institution.

Report your findings.

We would urge also that you take the time to write-up and distribute the results and lessons of your exchange on your campus, with your partner campus in the exchange, and also to a broader audience. Your board of trustees might be interested. Your work may well constitute a valuable model for other colleges—share your findings with colleges with which your institution has relationships (perhaps by denomination, geography, or other association). Ask your college's public relations department if your findings might translate into an article in a campus publication or the local newspaper.

Finally, and most importantly, let foundations know of your work. What you have accomplished may well form the base for further work under additional grants.

Manage the post-exchange process.

Official and planned exchange activities may cease, but that does not necessarily mean that the exchange process itself must end. As part of an evaluation of your exchange, consider whether some of its value can be continued. Are there ways to institutionalize the exchange's benefits, to make them permanent? Are there ways to continue a productive relationship with your partner institution? Are there ways to sustain institutional and individual momentum, interest, and commitment? Are other exchanges possible? And is your work a candidate for continued funding, either from campus sources or through external grants?

AFTERWARD

As this report attests, there is great power in interinstitutional exchanges. The Council of Independent Colleges is committed to helping colleges and universities tap into this power, and extend the relationships and cooperation that is reported on in these pages. To the extent that we can help you informally, the CIC staff stands ready to advise you, or to refer you to others who may be helpful. We wish you all the best in your exchange endeavors, and hope that you will find this approach as productive as we do.

APPENDIX
COLLEGES PARTICIPATING IN INTERINSTITUTIONAL EXCHANGES

A Component of the project Enhancing Black College Leadership
Sponsored by the Council of Independent Colleges
with the United Negro College Fund

Round I, February 1992

Barber-Scotia College (North Carolina) and **Muskingum College** (Ohio)—exchanges of academic and student life deans.

Benedict College (South Carolina) and **Columbia College** (South Carolina)—faculty exchanges in dance, English, human relations, and religion.

Bennett College (North Carolina) and **Converse College** (South Carolina)—faculty exchanges to help students design a course on "Leadership Skills for Women in a Multicultural Society" to be offered at both institutions.

Knoxville College (Tennessee) and **Maryville College** (Tennessee)—faculty exchanges to develop joint programs in teacher education and field trips in biology.

Oakwood College (Alabama) and **Dominican College of San Rafael** (California)—faculty exchanges in art and psychology.

Paine College (Georgia) and **North Central College** (Illinois)—faculty exchanges to meet diverse needs of each campus, ranging from identifying adult markets to role of church in college to study abroad.

Shaw University (North Carolina) and **Wilmington College** (Ohio)—exchanges centering around programs for prisoners.

Stillman College (Alabama) and **Marietta College** (Ohio)—faculty exchanges in a variety of areas, including freshman year programs, multicultural education, and business.

Wiley College (Texas) and **Simpson College** (Iowa)—faculty exchanges in business.

Round II, Part A, July 1992

Dillard University (Louisiana) and **Nazareth College of Rochester** (New York)—exchanges to provide diverse practicum experiences for teacher education students.

Johnson C. Smith University (North Carolina) and **Warren Wilson College** (North Carolina)—exchanges of middle management teams (admissions, registrar, financial aid), guest lecturers, and faculty-student teams to investigate programs not offered at their home institution.

Lane College (Tennessee) and **Juniata College** (Pennsylvania)—chief academic officers traded places for a week; faculty exchange in theater arts.

Oakwood College (Alabama) and **Bradford College** (Massachusetts)—consulting focused on library collections and automation, and integrating multicultural perspectives into general education courses.

Rust College (Mississippi) and **Drury College** (Missouri)—exchanges in art, English, undergraduate research, freshman studies, and of student choirs.

Wilberforce University (Ohio) and **Ohio Dominican College** (Ohio)—a year-long collaborative effort of faculties responsible for teaching writing.

Round II, Part B, November 1992

Bethune Cookman College (Florida), **Azusa Pacific University** (California) and **Westmont College** (California)—administrative exchanges, faculty exchanges, and team teaching opportunities.

Jarvis Christian College (Texas), **Juniata College** (Pennsylvania), and **Seton Hill College** (Pennsylvania)—the presidents of these colleges defined their exchange as "a small model consortium to address some issues of mutual concern and interest," particularly those related to understanding the challenges of diversity on their campuses.

Round III, June 1993

Huston-Tillotson College (Texas) and **Elmhurst College** (Illinois)—faculty from Elmhurst shared their successful strategies for Writing Across the Curriculum, while faculty from Huston-Tillotson advised Elmhurst on its efforts to educate students about the perspectives and contributions of people from different ethnic backgrounds and cultures.

LeMoyne-Owen College (Tennessee) and **Doane College** (Nebraska)—exchanges with five faculty visiting lecturers (in politics, business, teacher education and the humanities) to help staff and students at both institutions broaden their cultural perspectives.

Morehouse College (Georgia) and **Lewis University** (Illinois)—faculty from each campus advised each other on their respective programs to improve multicultural awareness through curricular and co-curricular programs.

Fisk University (Tennessee) and **Cornell College** (Iowa)—delegations of faculty and administrators shared expertise on a range of programs: the core curriculum, women's studies, library automation, integrating multiculturalism across the curriculum, and intergroup relations.

Round IV, June 1994

Administrators, faculty and students involved in teacher education programs in historically black private colleges participated in reciprocal exchanges with their counterparts in other independent colleges. The following colleges and universities participated in this round of the exchange program to foster intercultural understanding among future school teachers, encourage more students to pursue teaching careers, and forge cooperative relationships between different types of institutions.

Claflin College (South Carolina) and **Lincoln Memorial University** (Tennessee)

Livingstone College (North Carolina) and **Illinois Benedictine College**

Miles College (Alabama) and **Brescia College** (Kentucky)

Philander Smith College (Arkansas) and **Nebraska Wesleyan University**

Saint Paul's College (Virginia) and **Eastern Mennonite College** (Virginia)

Talladega College (Alabama) and **Columbia College** (Missouri)

Voorhees College (South Carolina) and **Colby-Sawyer College** (New Hampshire)

Round V, 1996

As this report goes to press, CIC has issued a request for proposals for another round of exchanges. Grant funds will support up to six exchanges.

CIC

Council of Independent Colleges
One Dupont Circle, Suite 320
Washington, DC 20036-1110

Tel: (202) 466-7230 Fax: (202) 466-7238
e-mail: cic@cic.ncne;edu

BEST COPY AVAILABLE